



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

able, and, taken all in all, the new edition is a highly creditable one.

A few typographical errors have been noted: Introduction, p. xxv, *onef o* for *one of*; Notes, p. 98, Gr.—for Gr. *ὁῦγγονοι*; p. 105, l. 319 for 321; p. 109, l. 421, *Artimis* for *Artemis*; p. 116, l. 765, for 766; p. 122, l. 1094, *Er-fühlt* for *Erfüllt*.

W. A. ADAMS.

Yale University.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

An English Grammar for the Use of High School, Academy, and College Classes, by W. M. BASKERVILL and J. W. SEWELL. New York: 1896.

MESSRS. BASKERVILL and SEWELL are to be congratulated on the excellence of their *English Grammar*. They consider grammar as an historic growth, and their treatment is logical in that it is historical. While the learner is spared the infliction of details necessary to a more technical knowledge of modern grammar, he is yet given such a view of the history of certain forms as will enable him to grasp with readiness their signification at the present day. Thus the relation between the singular and plural of the third personal pronoun is briefly stated, so that the pupil may see the cause of the present difference in form. Similar examples of this wise reference to historical development are seen in the treatment of the forms of irregular comparison, the use of the present for the future tense, and the irregular conjugation of strong and weak verbs. The statement that "*bad* and *ill* were borrowed from the Norse" is only half true; *ill* is Norse, but *bad* probably comes from A.-S. *gebæded* (see *The Oxford Dict.*).

The many examples quoted are taken from "the leading or 'standard' literature of modern times; that is, from the eighteenth century on. This *literary English* is considered the foundation on which grammar must rest."

"Spoken or colloquial English" is also quoted to show certain phases of development, and specimens of survival in modern speech. The standard quotations are almost invariably from the best authors, but one must object to *The Critic* as being considered a standard, especially when it is held responsible for such a

sentence as this: "The Messrs. Harper have done the more than generous thing by Mr. Du Maurier." The specimens of colloquial English are such as have acquired very general use in vulgar speech, and admit of a more or less general classification; such are the use of the nominative for the objective, as "between you and I," the objective for the nominative, as "Whom they agree was rather nice looking," etc.

The book is divided into three parts; i. The Parts of Speech, and Inflection; ii. Analysis of Sentences; iii. The Uses of Words, or Syntax.

A very good feature of the *Grammar* is the clearness of the definitions. The authors generally begin with an illustrative example, in order that they may the more readily lead up to what they intend to define; the pupil has in his mind the concrete functions of the abstract conception. Thus, in the treatment of Nouns, a sentence is quoted containing illustrations of the principal kinds of nouns, which are explained in relation to their signification. The pupil is now ready to understand the definition.

The distinction between the verbal noun, and the participle and gerund is carefully observed. In many older Grammars a false distinction was made to exist between the verbal noun and the gerund.

In the treatment of Gender, the illogical classes of "neuter gender" and "common gender" are done away with, by considering gender as founded on sex; where the sex is not known by the word itself, or by some other word in the immediate context, the word is said to be not of "common gender" but a "neuter noun." Thus in "A little *child* shall lead them," *child* is a neuter noun; but in "A curious *child* applying to *his* ear," *child* is masculine gender, because the pronoun *his* denotes the male sex.

Person is not now regarded as a distinction of nouns. The older method of considering the noun as being of the same person as the pronoun with which it is in apposition, is no longer tenable. Nor is it proper to regard all nouns as of the third person. The three persons are preserved by our authors for the personal pronouns, though the third person is paradoxical.

The frequent reference to early modern English justifies the criticism that *which* in the Bible refers to persons, though in present English "it refers to animals, things, or ideas, not to persons." Thus "Our Father, *which* art in Heaven," Luke xi, 2.

The parsing of the relative *what*, as fulfilling merely one function, is more logical than considering it as being *that which*. Both methods are given here with, however, a preference for the former.

The remark that "in early modern English, *as* was used just as we use *that* or *which*, not following the word *such*" is an over-statement. It is doubtful whether *as* was ever established as a relative.

In the lists of strong and weak verbs, the following forms, which occur in the literature of early modern English, are omitted: *digged*, *drave* (pret.), *holden* (p.p.), *spake* (pret.) *stauk* (pret.), *catched*, *shredded*, *stringed* (p.p.), *sware* (pret.), *writ* (p.p.), *builded*.

In the discussion of *sit* and *set*, the intransitive use of *set*, as "his eyes *set* in his head," may be explained by the reflexive use; we still say "*Set yourself* to work." In the expression "the sun has *set*," there is probably the influence of *settle*; the Anglo Saxon has "sunne on *settle* sie," "sah to *settle*," and in Middle English we find "Til pe sunne wæs *setled* to reste."

In their treatment of Adverbs (p. 183), our authors say that "sometimes an adverb may modify a noun or a pronoun." Thus in the sentence, 'the young man reveres men of genius, because, to speak truly, they are *more* himself than he is,' *more* is an adverb modifying *himself*. But this violates the function of the adverb, which can modify only a verb, an adjective, or another adverb. *More*, in this sentence, modifies the predicate *are himself*; its position before *himself* gives it the appearance of modifying the pronoun. So may be explained *altogether*, in "nor was it altogether nothing," which modifies the predicate *was nothing*; *almost*, in "joy is almost pain," which modifies the predicate *is pain*; *exactly*, in "is exactly that of Coleridge's Ancient Mariner," which modifies the predicate *is that of, etc.*; and *incidentally* in "he was incidentally newsdealer," which also modifies

the predicate. These cases are all clear, and they owe the peculiar meaning to the order of words, to a device of rhetoric, not a principle of grammar. *Almost*, in "to the almost terror," is an adverb used as an adjective, on the analogy of the adverbs of time used adjectively, a Greek construction taken up in English, as "our *often* infirmities."

The second instance is not so easy. "Is it *only* poets . . . who live with nature?" In this instance there is no special difficulty in regarding *only* as the modifier of *is poets*; but, if we take an example in which the verb is of greater significance than *is*, we shall see the full force of the contention of our authors. Thus, "I borrowed *only* the book." Here the meaning is that the book was all that I borrowed. If *only* preceded *borrowed*, it would mean that, in relation to the book, I did nothing but borrow it. In the latter case, *only* manifestly modifies *borrowed*; what does it modify in the former? Apparently, book: yet, if it modifies *book* and nothing else, it must be an adjective—or our grammatical distinctions might as well not exist. If it is an adjective, it must convey a complete idea and be independent of the verb; yet we do not get its full meaning till the verb is taken into consideration: in other words, *only* is distributed between *borrowed* and *book*, and must be considered as an adverb, modifying the verb in its relation to the object. This, of course, is to be distinguished from the use of *only* as a modifier of the whole sentence, when it would signify that borrowing the book was the only thing I did in this instance. So, in the sentence, "only poets live with nature," *only* is likewise an adverb of limitation or degree, limiting by distribution *poets* and *live with nature*.

This and *that* in "*this* much" and "*that* much" are properly regarded by our authors as adverbs: they correspond to the adverbial (the old instrumental) use of the article.

The troublesome subject of the prepositions is treated with clearness and precision, and is illumined by numerous illustrations. A very good chapter is that called "words that need watching." These words are *that*, *what*, *but*, *as*, *like*. *Like* is either an adjective, as "that face, *like* summer's ocean," or a subordinate

conjunction of manner, as "he grows frantic and beats the air *like* Carlyle." Nothing is said as to the government of the following word, unless we are to infer that the adjective retains the governing power it had in Anglo-Saxon, which is, indeed, the case, and that the conjunction takes the same case after as before it.

Under the adverbial use of the participle, the pupil is cautioned against regarding a participial phrase as necessarily adjectival. Thus in the sentence, "the letter of introduction, *containing no matter of business*, was speedily run through," the clause in italics is adverbial. But does it not qualify *letter*, and must not *containing* be parsed as a participle agreeing with *letter*? We make the sentence "the letter, which contained no matter, etc.," and, though the idea is plainly that the letter was speedily run through *because* it contained no matter of business, *yet* this clause must be analyzed as adjectival. An attributive clause may express relations of cause, time, place, etc.

In the sentence, "he went several times to England, *where he does not seem to have attracted any attention*," are our authors correct in regarding the italicized clause as adverbial? Does it not rather modify *England*, and must it not, therefore, be an adjectival clause, and equal to "in which country, etc.?"

The points of disagreement between the reviewer and his authors are, for the most part, insignificant. In its plan and execution, in its definitions and illustrations, this book fulfills all the requirements of the purpose it is intended to serve, and deserves a most favorable reception from the schools and colleges of this country.

JAS. W. TUPPER.

Philadelphia.

ENGLISH SOUNDS.

Untersuchungen zur Englischen Lautgeschichte, von KARL LUICK: 8vo, pp. xvi, 334. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1896.

MUCH water will flow down the Rhine yet before the completion, humanly speaking, of every chapter of the history of English sounds down to our own day; before the story is told

—one coherent story—of the outer and inner phonetic life of successive or co-existent literary languages and strata, of Old, Middle and Modern English dialects, of the relations of each of these to the rest, and the bearing of all of them on the genesis and growth of modern standard English. Much as has been achieved since Ellis' great work placed the phonological study of English on a scientific basis less than thirty years ago—*E. E. P.*, vols. i, ii, 1869; iii, 1870; iv, 1874; v, 1889—a glance at Sweet and Kluge (*H. E. S.* 1888, *Grdr.* i, 1891) suffices to show how many gaps need to be filled in order to prepare the way for relatively true insight into the factors and processes of sound-change during the whole course, and over the whole area, of English speech.

The modern period especially is still largely unexplored, although, thanks to Ellis, such exploration has become in no small degree either merely a work of corroboration, of correction in details, of extension, or an examination of a vast body of carefully verified evidence. We know most about the one dialect raised by special circumstances above the rest, the language of literature and education; its precise origin, however, the rate and chronology of change, the manner in which it spread over a continuously widening area and attained to supremacy at last, the modifications it underwent in consequence of dialect mixture—these are questions the answers to which can at present be only partial and tentative. Least understood, for reasons not far to seek, is the historical development of the sound-systems of modern dialects. Yet the main key to the problems just mentioned must presumably be sought here, while light on the affiliation of existing varieties of pronunciation with their ME. prototypes would clear up ME. dialectal conditions, make an adequate conception possible of English speech in its unity and diversity, and greatly enrich and deepen our knowledge of linguistic laws in general.

Every student of English phonology will, therefore, heartily welcome Luick's brilliant attempt to treat, from the points of view indicated, a cardinal portion of the vowel-system in dialects still existing in England. Nor is it